DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 273 VT 019 712

AUTHOR	Meyer, Judy
TITLE	The Development of Evaluative Criteria for Training the Handicapped: A Summary of Project Activities.
INSTITUTION	Houston Univ., Tex. Center for Human Resources.
SPONS AGENCY	Texas Education Agency, Austin. Div. of Occupational Research and Development.
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	35p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation Criteria; *Guidelines; *Handicapped; *Pilot Projects; Program Administration; Program Evaluation; Program Planning; Program Proposals; Special Education; *Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS	*Texas

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the year's activities of a project designed to: (1) review pilot programs in vocational education for the handicapped in Texas, (2) develop guidelines for the Texas Education Agency to use in evaluating pilot proposals for training the handicapped under provisions of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, and (3) develop guidelines for school districts to follow in designing and evaluating programs for the handicapped. The review of pilot programs is available as VT 019 703, while the guidelines for proposal evaluation and self-evaluation of programs are available as VT 019 713 and VT 019 714, respectively, in this issue. (SB)

ED 074273

The Development of Evaluative Criteria For Training the Handicapped: A Summary of Project Activities

by
Judy Meyer

Center for Human Resources
College of Business Administration
University of Houston
Houston, Texas
1972

VT019712

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 074273

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR TRAINING THE HANDICAPPED: A SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Submitted to

The Division of Occupational Research and Development
of the
Texas Education Agency
Under Contracts 29227 and 38155

by

Judy Meyer

Center for Human Resources
College of Business Administration
University of Houston
Houston, Texas
September, 1972

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks and appreciation to Mrs. Jane Lerner, Assistant to the Director of the Center, for her endless and invaluable assistance in preparing this report. She meticulously extracted data from periodic progress reports, offered countless needed editorial suggestions, supervised format standardization and the preliminary and final typing--ad infinitum--for this and the other three reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
PROJECT OBJECTIVES	2
METHODOLOGY	2
Advisory Committees	2
Field Research	4
Literature Review	8
RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS	8
CONCLUSIONS	10
APPENDICES	15
A. Advisory Committee for TEA Study of Vocational Training for the Handicapped	17
B. Resource Persons	18
C. Texas Field Visits and Persons Contacted	19
D. In-State Field Questionnaire	25
E. Letters Sent to States and Response	26
F. Out-of-State Field Visits and Persons Contacted	28
G. Out-of-State Field Questionnaire	32
H. Composite Answers from 14 ESCs	33

THE DEVELOPMENT OF EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR TRAINING THE HANDICAPPED: A SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES

INTRODUCTION

Since the passage of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act, states have been required to allocate at least 10 percent of their federal vocational allotment to the occupational preparation of the handicapped. While rehabilitation programs for the handicapped go back many decades in the United States and Texas, specific job training of the handicapped has been a field not well researched especially in terms of criteria for proposal and program evaluation. As the number of vocational programs for the handicapped has increased, this lack of an effective evaluation procedure has become a critical problem.

After operating pilot vocational programs for the handicapped for three years, the Texas Education Agency felt the need for a set of guidelines which would assist in reviewing the adequacy of pilot program proposals and would provide a vehicle through which such programs could be systematically monitored and evaluated. School districts also need a set of criteria in the form of a self-evaluation guide to monitor their own programs.

In order to fill these needs, TEA funded the Center for Human Resources, College of Business Administration, University of Houston to conduct a one year research project to develop these guidelines and criteria. The project, funded in August, 1971, was called, The Development of Evaluative Criteria for the Training of the Handicapped.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The contract outlined two objectives for this project. The primary objective was to develop a set of guidelines for the Texas Education Agency for evaluation of pilot proposals for training the handicapped under provisions of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968. A secondary objective was the development of a set of guidelines for school districts to follow in designing such programs and a self-evaluation guide for program monitoring. As the project progressed, the third and probably the most important objective evolved. The project was to take a broad overview of the pilot programs operating in Texas and the state system governing these programs. This was to enable the Project Coordinator to make recommendations for more effective programs in the future.

METHODOLOGY

While the project was funded by TEA in August, work on the project actually began on September 1, 1971. The entire project took one year. Project staff consisted of Miss Judy Meyer, the full-time Project Coordinator and a half-time research assistant, Ray Horsak.

Advisory Committees

The Project Coordinator worked under the direction of two committees. The first developed was the Research Committee, made up of Dr. J. Earl Williams, Director of the Center for Human Resources; Dr. Roger N. Blakeney, Professor of Behavioral Management Science; and Dr. Robert W. Lawless, Professor of Quantitative Management Science. This committee's task was to draw up the research design. It was decided at the first meeting that it would be more

feasible for the Project Coordinator to visit a number of pilot programs throughout Texas, rather than to spend time with fewer programs in greater depth. The committee also discussed the kinds of information desired from field visits and the means to elicit this information. The Research Committee continued to meet until the Project Coordinator had firmly determined her methods of data collection.

An Advisory Committee was set up to assist the entire project. Dr. Joseph E. Champagne, President of the Houston Community College, served as Chairman, and resource persons throughout the state served on the committee. A complete list of committee members is contained in Appendix A. The first Advisory Committee meeting was primarily an exchange of information and familiarization with the project. The second meeting raised questions as to the format of final reports. A final meeting had been planned to review rough drafts of the reports in late July, however this was not held due to the resignation of the Project Coordinator from the University in mid-July. All reports were completed after this date, and time constraints prevented sending rough drafts to all Advisory Committee members.

In addition to these two committees, the Project Coordinator also interviewed numerous resource persons throughout the state. A complete list of these persons is contained in Appendix B.

Drafts of the factual information contained in the overview report were reviewed by appropriate education personnel (from TEA, several ESCs, several local school districts and out-of-state Departments of Education). Copies of specific program descriptions were sent to the Project Directors of each program to verify accuracy.

Field Research

By far the most time consuming and valuable portion of this project were the field trips made by the Project Coordinator to programs throughout Texas and ten other states. It had been suggested by TEA that the Project Coordinator should begin by visiting as many of the programs in Texas as possible prior to out of state visits. The Texas pilot programs to be visited were chosen by reviewing the 1970-71 Directory of Pilot Project Personnel of Vocational Education for the Handicapped by TEA. Programs were picked based on those operating the largest number of vocational units as well as those clustered around major geographical areas. Pilot programs were chosen from independent school districts, state schools and state hospitals, and regional Education Services Centers (ESCs). The chart below shows the scope of Texas visits:

Statistical Review of Texas Pilot Programs Visited

	Texas Pilot Programs		
	Independent School Districts (ISDs)	State Schools/ State Hospitals (SS/SH)	Education Service Centers (ESCs)
Number visited 9/1/71-5/30/72	27	9	10
Totals in directory (1970-71)	67	12	15
% visited to Total	40%	75%	67%

	Vocational Units in Texas Pilot Programs Above	
	Independent School Districts (ISDs)	State Schools/ State Hospitals (SS/SH)
Number visited 9/1/71-5/30/72	67	25
Totals in directory (1970-71)	125	30
% visited to Total	54%	83%

Appendix C contains a list of the programs visited and the 180 persons contacted on these Texas field trips.

The format for all the in-state field visits was similar. Advance letters were sent out to superintendents explaining the focus of the project and requesting an appointment. This was followed by a telephone call to the superintendent to determine appropriate contact people and to obtain appointments. The Project Coordinator was referred to either the Vocational Director or the Special Education Director within the independent school system. When possible, the Project Coordinator met first with the director to whom she was referred, then with the director of the other discipline, and finally with the vocational teachers. The visits consisted first of an explanation of the project objectives with emphasis on the fact that the visitor was not evaluating the program, but seeking input into realistic ways to evaluate future programs. A list of questions asked on these visits is contained in Appendix D. Extensive notes were made after the visits, and follow-up letters were always sent thanking the involved people for their time and assistance.

In January, the Project Coordinator began to contact persons out of state. First, letters were sent to the 49 other states and Puerto Rico, requesting information about their VEH (Vocational Education for Handicapped) programs. A copy of the questionnaire and a list of states responding is contained in Appendix E. A total of 27 states and Puerto Rico responded to the questionnaire and similar information was collected on five additional states through visits.

During January the Project Coordinator also began refining a list of states to visit. First, a call was made to persons in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) in Washington. Miss Barbara Kemp (Special Population Section Programs) was contacted, and she suggested calling Mr. George Klinkhamer (Office of Education, Bureau of Education for

the Handicapped, State Plan Officer, Aid to States Branch) and Mrs. Frances Glee Saunders (Office of Education, Program Officer, Special Populations Program, Division of Vocational-Technical Education). Those two persons were asked which states they felt were the most innovative and successful in their approach to the vocational education of handicapped students. Generally, they were in agreement as to which states were the most active, but no one could say which states had the most successful programs as there is no consistent evaluation procedure to define and measure effectiveness. Mrs. Saunders did suggest that at least one state be visited in each of the ten HEW regions. She sent a copy of the HEW Regional Directory for reference. HEW Administrators in some regions were also contacted for their advice as to the best programs to visit. The chart below shows the 14 states visited (including Texas) with their corresponding HEW region number:

HEW Region	States
1	Massachusetts
2	New York
3	Pennsylvania
4	Florida
	Georgia
5	Ohio
	Illinois
	Minnesota
	Michigan (Detroit only)
6	Texas
7	Missouri (St. Louis County only)
8	Colorado
9	California
10	Washington

A complete list of the site visits and the 81 persons contacted in states other than Texas is contained in Appendix F.

The format for out-of-state visits was very similar to that for Texas. A personal phone call was made first to the designated state contact person for handicapped programs to explain the purpose of the proposed visit and to request the state office to identify outstanding local programs. With two exceptions (Colorado and Massachusetts), the Project Coordinator first visited the state contact person prior to visiting local programs within the state. During this visit specific questions were asked (see Appendix G) and as much information as possible was collected concerning the state's approach to programs for the handicapped. The state office then usually made the final arrangements for the visits to local program sites. Questions asked of the local program personnel in the other states were similar to those asked in Texas (Appendix D).

All out-of-state visits were made by the Project Coordinator with three exceptions. The trip to Illinois and St. Louis, Missouri, was made by Mrs. Mary Jane Hatt, a doctoral candidate in the College of Education, University of Houston. The information on Minnesota was collected by Mrs. Ellen Koshenina, the Project Coordinator's former administrative assistant now living in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. Mrs. Mary Schiflett, a Research Associate at the Center for Human Resources, visited programs in the Detroit area.

While the out-of-state visits were valuable, they did not give comprehensive overviews of any states which would enable any comparisons between states. One must keep in mind that:

a) the state's several best programs were pre-selected by the state education agency for site visits;

b) time and/or transportation limitations influenced the choice of programs to visit;

c) visiting three to five programs in a state does not constitute a representation of all programs from which one can generalize; and

d) spending one day on a program site visit can elicit cursory information only.

Despite these limitations, program visits throughout the country did help in the identification of effective program components necessary for maximized vocational success of the handicapped.

The field research was completed in early June, 1972.

Literature Review

While the Project Coordinator was making field visits, the Research Assistant was reviewing as much of the available literature as possible. The ERIC system was studied carefully, and relevant studies were ordered. Journals in the fields of welfare, education, sociology and psychology were reviewed. Also reviewed were publications of the U.S. Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare. This review covered 1968 to the present.

Overall the results of the literature review were disappointing. Little information was found that could be related to this project. However, materials have been collected related to general vocational training which should be useful to future researchers.

RESULTS AND IMPLICATIONS

The results of this research are contained in four reports for the Texas Education Agency. Three of the reports relate to specific project objectives, the fourth is a summary of the year's activities. The general report is an outgrowth of the evolved objective--a general overview of Texas programs and recommendations for future programs--and is the largest and probably the most important. This report titled, A Review of Pilot Vocational Programs for The Handicapped in Texas, contains historical information relating to these programs and an overview of the planning and organizational structure for pilot programs in the state. All phases of programs run by

local school districts, ESCs, state schools and state hospitals and junior colleges are reviewed and analyzed. Recommendations are then made for each level of program administration--the state, local school districts, ESCs, and state schools and state hospitals. Rationale is presented to justify each recommendation. State information from most of the states visited is presented, and unusual programs and approaches are described. Finally, the report contains a statistical summary of the pilot programs in Texas and in the other states.

This general report should prove of use to all persons involved in these pilot programs in Texas and in other states. This general overview of the various approaches to vocational education of the handicapped should give new ideas and insights to persons directing and working in the programs. The recommendations, if implemented, could vastly improve the delivery of vocational services to the handicapped.

The primary objective of this project is to give TEA a set of guidelines for proposal evaluation. This is contained in the Guide to Proposal Evaluation for Vocational Education of the Handicapped. This guide gives TEA, and other funding agencies, a means to evaluate proposals for funding to insure that only programs with clear objectives, well thought out methods and procedures, and a means of self evaluation are funded. The guide suggests a format for proposal writing and submission which emphasizes conciseness and clarity. It offers specific questions which should be answered in every proposal. If these questions are not answered, chances are the program idea has not been clearly thought out and is not likely to succeed.

The third report, A Self Evaluation Guide for Local Districts for Vocational Education of Handicapped Students, gives local program personnel a means to monitor their program operations. The guide first examines the need

for a clearly developed program design with specific objectives as the foundation on which program evaluation is based. The report then discusses evaluation stages: evaluation of the program's progress toward meeting the stated objectives; evaluation of interlocking services which contribute to the desired outcome; and finally the evaluation of the product. The guide contains a checklist for program evaluation and also a questionnaire for program personnel. This guide should assist local personnel in drawing up better proposals by developing specific objectives in the program design, as well as providing, through the checklists, a means for constantly monitoring the program to insure that it meets the stated objectives.

The final report of the project is this summary report. This report summarizes the year's activities on the project, outlining the project objectives, methodology, results, implications and conclusions. Hopefully, this summary report gives a clear overview of what has been accomplished over the past year.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of the project are contained in the general report. These conclusions take the form of recommendations aimed at improving the delivery of vocational services to the handicapped in Texas. Recommendations are made for the State, local school districts, ESCs, and state schools and state hospitals. For summarizing purposes, they are listed here without the rationale which was included in the general report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

For the State Level

1. That Texas resolves the direction to take in the vocational education of handicapped students in favor of directing the majority of them into the mainstream of vocational education.
   If this recommendation is accepted, communication and coordination must be improved to insure that all interlocking facets in the educational process contribute to the readiness and acceptance of special needs students into the vocational system.

2. For the top administrators of Special Education, Vocational Education and Vocational Rehabilitation not only to listen to each other, but for each to listen with a willingness to make adjustments in direction and reallocate priorities, where necessary, to provide the best possible services to handicapped students. In other words, for state level planning to start with the specific needs of the handicapped student--and the subsequent designing of a single optimum system of delivery of services to these students--rather than attempting to fit services into three existing structures. It would seem advisable for a position paper to be written by representatives of all three disciplines and signed by the three top administrators for distribution throughout the state educational and rehabilitation channels.

3. After agreement at the highest state administrative levels of the direction which vocational education of the handicapped will take in the state, and a design of a coordinated team effort, such information should be disseminated to local levels in the form of guidelines, developed jointly--in one document--and signed and distributed by all three. The state agencies should give high priority toward "selling" the concept to local administrators and Boards of Education.

4. The Texas Education Agency, Division of Occupational Technology, should designate at least two professionals as "Special Needs" consultants.

5. All special teacher training, and newly developing programs which effect vocational education, directly or indirectly, should involve special educational and vocational education together in planning. The requirements for VAC certification should be reviewed critically and consideration given to necessity for work experience in business/industry and some formal counseling training.

6. That Special Education develop pre-vocational shops at the Junior High level, with the assistance of vocational education, to be supported through Special Education funding.

7. That Special Education EMR students be encouraged, and allowed to enter regular vocational training at the high school level, with supportive services as needed. VEH money should be focused on high school level training with necessary supportive services and/or curriculum modification.

8. General Recommendations:
   a. Proposals need more planning and documentation. Objectives must be well thought out and specific to allow for evaluation.

b. Follow-up studies - further overview of VEH program: follow-up of students.

For Local School Districts

1. That all proposals for vocational education of the handicapped be planned, designed and submitted jointly by the local administrators of Special Education and Vocational Education. The proposal should be signed by both parties before the state should consider it for funding.

2. Strong consideration should be given to developing comprehensive vocational adjustment centers in conjunction with planning for new area vocational high schools throughout the state.

3. Elements which need to be included in vocational programs for the handicapped: class location, parental involvement, employer involvement, related education, vocational curriculum.

For Education Service Centers

1. The existing ESC Phase I personnel be utilized as trainers to enable school personnel to become proficient in conducting their own vocational evaluation of special education students. For each Phase I staff member funded through VEH money, it is recommended that special education fund one ESC position for this purpose, too.

2. That special education funds one position for career education development in each ESC, such a staff person to be vocationally qualified and included in the total staff involved with the career education model.

3. That the ESC sponsor workshop meetings, through TEA support, to be jointly attended by vocational and special education directors for the purpose of (a) open communication between the two groups and (b) to be used for planning vocational programs for the handicapped.

For State Schools/State Hospitals

1. That the policy which set the upper age limit for participation in VEH programs at 21 years of age be re-examined and modified for the SS/SH programs to enable any resident with vocational capacity, 16 and older, to participate in the program. It would be preferable not to set a maximum age limit, but rather be guided by the feasibility of employment after training.

2. That strong support be given MH/MRs request for State Minimum Foundation Allocation funding.

3. That it be recognized the only goal of vocational training in a state school for retarded may not be competitive employment, and that MH/MR administration work with the school personnel to develop viable, alternative paid work opportunities for students who complete vocational training. The alternative work opportunities should be investigated and documented before additional vocational training is initiated in these schools, to insure its responsiveness to local possibilities for protected employment.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR TEA STUDY OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Dr. Joseph Champagne, President
Houston Community College
3830 Richmond
Houston, Texas

Mr. Jack Moneyhon
Houston Lighthouse for the Blind
3530 West Dallas
Houston, Texas 77019

Mr. Charles Jones, Vocational Director
Bryan Independent School District
2200 Villa Maria Road
Bryan, Texas 77801

Mr. Frank Borreca, Executive Director
Harris County Center for the Retarded
3550 West Dallas
Houston, Texas 77019

Dr. L. X. Magnifico/Mr. Johnny Means
Rio Grande Independent Rehabilitation District
P. O. Box 570
Edinburg, Texas 78539

Dr. D. E. Bailey, Director
Beaumont Education Service Center Region V
P. O. Box 3546
Beaumont, Texas 77704

Mr. Paul Moreno
District 67-3
Southwest National Bank Building
El Paso, Texas 79901

Mr. Bill Nunnelly, Coordinator Coop Program
Texas Rehabilitation Commission
5619 Fannin
Houston, Texas 77004

Mr. Don Fariss, Consultant
Texas Department of Mental Health & Mental Retardation
Box 12668, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711

Mrs. Freddie Wagner, VAC
Palestine ISD
814 S. Fulton Street
Palestine, Texas 75801

Mr. Ray Barber/Mr. Oscar Millican/
Mr. T. R. Jones
Texas Education Agency
Division of Occupational Research & Development
201 East Eleventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

APPENDIX B

RESOURCE PERSONS

Mr. Albert Bartschmid, Texas Education Agency, Vocational Consultant to Special Education

Mr. Frank Borreca, Executive Director, Harris County Center for Retarded

Dr. Rudi Capobianco, Professor, College of Education, University of Houston

Mr. Ray Fenley, Consultant, Texas Education Agency, Special Education, Pupil Appraisal

Ms. Tommye Frye, ESC, Region IV

Mr. Charles Funk, District Director, Texas Rehabilitation Commission

Dr. George Garver, Superintendent, Houston Independent School District

Mr. Alton Ice, Director, Vocational Advisory Council

Dr. Frank James, Director of Research, Houston Independent School District

Mr. Lindley, Houston Independent School District, Special Education

Dr. Bruce Mattson, Professor Special Education, Texas Tech University

Mr. Jack Moneyhon, Lighthouse for the Blind

Dr. Robert Montgomery, Texas Education Agency, Assistant Commissioner for Special Education & Special Schools

Dr. Alfred Moore, Professor Special Education, University of Houston

Mr. Bill Nunnelly, Texas Rehabilitation Commission, Coop School Program

Mr. Don Partridge, Texas Education Agency, Director of Special Education

Mr. Arthur Phillips, Consultant, Texas Education Agency, Special Education

Dr. Conwell Strickland, Professor Special Education, Baylor College

APPENDIX C

TEXAS FIELD VISITS & PERSONS CONTACTED

Independent School Districts

Abilene Independent School District	Mr. Jeter, Vocational Director Mr. George Kampert, Special Education Director Mr. Bill Jones, Occupational Coop, Consultant Mr. Dalton Johnson, BM & R Teacher Mr. James Headstream, Teacher Aide Ms. Louise Smith, H & CS Teacher Ms. Katherine Owen, Teacher Aide Mr. Shelby Smith, Executive Director--West Texas Rehabilitation Center
Aldine Independent School District	Ms. Joy Thorne, Special Education Director Mr. Jerry Keeble, Vocational Director Mr. John Bush, BM & R Teacher Mr. T. C. Livingston, BM & R Teacher Ms. Sally Cullom, H & CS Teacher Ms. Gladys Grice, H & CS Teacher
Alvin Independent School District	Dr. Drachenberg, Director of Curriculum Mr. Bill Ament, VO Teacher
Arlington Independent School	Mr. O'Neal Harris, Vocational Director Ms. Griffin, Special Education Director Mr. Tony Arterburn, Vocational Counselor Ms. Linda Richardson, Special Education Counselor Mr. Word, GCT Teacher Mr. Tom McCrary, ODP Teacher
Brenham Independent School District	Ms. Schmidt, Special Education Director Ms. McCesland, VAC Mr. Hughes, Vocational Counselor Mr. Ollie Williams, GCT Teacher Ms. Mildred Jacob, H & CS Teacher
Bryan Independent School District	Mr. Charles Jones, Vocational Director Ms. Bradley, Special Education Teacher Mr. Rex Jackson, HR Teacher Mr. Zack Grays, BM & R Teacher Ms. Gail Witt, OO Teacher
Brownsville Independent School District	Mr. James Ogg, Superintendent Mr. Kirby, Director, Special Services Mr. Rivira, Principal Ms. Castro, Supervisor, Special Education, Vocational Unit Mr. Humberto de Leon, GCT Teacher Mr. Caesar Vitier, H & CS Teacher

APPENDIX C CONT'D

Independent School Districts Cont'd

Corpus Christi Independent School District	Mr. Ken Cross, Vocational Director Ms. Janie Young, Special Education Consultant Ms. Freddie Hayslip, Vocational Consultant Ms. Adell Fogaley, H & CS Teacher Ms. Lois Haywood, H & CS Teacher Aide Ms. Leona Blackmon, GCT Teacher
Dallas Independent School District	Mr. W. T. Puryear, Director, Special Education Ms. Frances Threalkeld, Coordinator Mr. Johnson, Principal, Dallas Vocational High School Mr. Bullard, VAC, Dallas Vocational High School Ms. Sara Bloomfield, Dallas Vocational High School Ms. Donna Gray, H & CS Teacher Ms. B. R. Moore, H & CS Teacher Aide Mr. C. J. Leath, GCT Teacher
Del Valle Independent School District	Mr. McBee, Assistant Superintendent Ms. Pouliot, Special Education Director Mr. Rolan Lawson, HR Teacher Ms. Ruth Willis, H & CS Teacher
Denton Independent School District	Mr. Johnny Guyer, Ad. Assistant Mr. Jimmy Daniels, GCT Teacher Ms. Pender, H & CS Ms. Dorothy Minton, Director Special Education
El Paso Independent School District	Mr. Jim Howsley, Principal-Vocational School Mr. Fuquay, BM & R Teacher Mr. Marsh, FS Teacher Mr. Hill, GMR Teacher Ms. Windham, H & CS Teacher
Ft. Worth Independent School District	Mr. Robert McAbee, Director, Vocational Education Mr. Lester Jones, Vocational Supervisor Mr. Jo Kelly, Special Education Director Mr. Ray Griffin, BMR Teacher Mr. E. H. Pedigo, GMR Teacher Ms. Joan Schleicher, H & CS Teacher Mr. Ralph Hooper, Vocational Counselor

APPENDIX C CONT'D

Independent School Districts Cont'd

Galena Park Independent School District	Mr. Ed Buie, Vocational Director Mr. McKenty, Special Education Director
Harlandale Independent School District	Mr. Manuel Gonzalez, Principal (Stinson School) Mr. Bill Bentley, Vocational Director Mr. McCall, Texas Rehabilitation Counselor Ms. Mildred Hess, VO Teacher
Harper School Independent School District	Mr. R. B. Parnell, Vocational Counselor Ms. H. J. Dawson, FS Teacher Mr. N. E. Clark, GCT Teacher Mr. J. C. Culpepper, GMR Teacher Ms. B. Cabeen, H & CC Teacher
Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District	Mr. Bliss Dodd, Special Education Director Mr. Joe Cox, Vocational Director
LaMarque Independent School District	Dr. Williams, Director of Curriculum Mr. Al Haart, Special Education Director Ms. Diane Blandy, H & CS Teacher Mr. A. J. Hill, GCT Teacher
North Forest Independent School District	Mr. Tollee Hart, Vocational Director Ms. Brenda Storey, Special Education Director Ms. Ursula Quintel, HR Teacher Aide
Northeast San Antonio Independent School District	Mr. Preston Smith, Director Special Education Mr. Oppelt, Vocational Director Mr. R. G. Paxton, VO Teacher Ms. Gail Roper, FS Teacher Mr. W. P. LeBlanc, BM & R Teacher
Northside Independent School District	Mr. Billy Spannegel, Vocational Director Mr. Scott Montfort, GCT Teacher Ms. Bates, H & CS Teacher
Pasadena Independent School District	Mr. Alfred Danheim, Director Special Services Mr. Card, Vocational Director Mr. Manuel Santos, VAC Mr. Jerry Davis, VAC
Rio Grande Rehabilitation	Mr. Johnny Means, Assistant Superintendent VR staff at evaluation center
San Marcos Independent School District	Mr. Bob Thomas, Director, Special Education Mr. Frank Mooney, Plastic Extrusion Teacher

APPENDIX C CONT'D

Independent School Districts Cont'd

Southside Independent School District	Mr. Darrell Pool, Superintendent Ms. Sanchez, Special Education Director
South San Antonio Independent School District	Mr. Joe Hutchinson, Superintendent Mr. Alvarez, Director Special Programs Mr. Coleman, Director Special Education Ms. Croft, Vocational Director Mr. Charles Moore, VO Teacher
Tulosa-Midway Independent School District	Ms. Reeves, Counselor Mr. Haynes, Principal

Education Service Center (ESC)

Abilene Education Service Center	Dr. Thomas Lawrence, Director Mr. Kyle Etheredge, Pupil Appraisal
Austin Education Service Center	Ms. Bettye Lacy, Special Education Director Ms. Joan Courtney, Pupil Evaluator
Beaumont Education Service Center	Dr. Bailey, Director Mr. Jim Laurent, Special Education Director Ms. Janette Sydow, Vocational Evaluator Mr. Marion Smith, Vocational Evaluator
Corpus Christi Education Service Center	Dr. Tope, Director Mr. Charles Shurley, Coordinator for Special Education Mr. Don Dozier, Chief Consultant Ms. Barbara Mabe, Consultant (p.e.)
El Paso Education Service Center	Mr. Coy Motley, Associate Director Mr. Ken Abrams, Project VIEW Coordinator
Ft. Worth Education Service Center	Mr. R. P. Campbell, Assistant Director, Ad. & Planning Ms. Barbara Beith, Pupil Appraisal Mr. Bill Lawrence, Consultant Services
Huntsville Education Service Center	Mr. Max Schlotter, Director Mr. Percy Pace, Evaluator
Lubbock Education Service Center	Mr. Don Morrow, Pupil Appraisal Mr. Travis Brown, Pupil Appraisal

APPENDIX C CONT'D

Education Service Centers Cont'd

Victoria Education Service Center	Dr. Grizzle, Director Mr. Ken Crow, Director, Special Education Mr. Bobby Platt, Pupil Evaluator
Waco Education Service Center	Mr. Mack Mullins, Director Mr. John Etheridge, Pupil Evaluator Ms. Annette Brister, Pupil Evaluator

State Schools/State Hospitals

Abilene State School	Mr. L. W. Cain, Superintendent Mr. Bill Waddill, Supervisor, School System Mr. Henry McGinty, Workshop Director Mr. John Stowe, TRC Director Evaluation & Training Center Mr. Troy Wood, BM & R Teacher Mr. Matthew Creeley, H & CS Teacher
Austin State Hospital	Mr. Joe Pierce, Director Rehabilitation Services Ms. Margaret Ashworth, Principal
Austin State School	Ms. Jane Duckett, Principal Mr. Jack Neill, SS Teacher Mr. Frank Pratt, Warewash Teacher
Denton State School	Mr. Dick Smith, Educational Director Mr. James Hudson, GCT Teacher Mr. Horace Preston, Production Workshop Mr. Hardy Bell, TR Counselor Mr. Lewis Ashby, Light Manufacturing
Lubbock State School	Dr. John Gladden, Superintendent Mr. Joe Burks, Principal Mr. Sam Buchanan, HR Teacher
Mexia State School	Mr. Lindsay Moore, Principal Ms. Dorothy Haskins, Vocational Director Mr. Billy Spruiell, GCT Teacher Mr. Charles Yelverton, GMR Teacher Ms. Mozelle Harrison, H & CS Teacher Mr. James Cogdell, HR Teacher Ms. Mary Jean Bevil, VO Teacher

APPENDIX C CONT'D

State Schools/State Hospitals Cont'd

Richmond State School	Mr. Charles Carpenter, Principal Ms. Glenda Garrett, H & CS Teacher Mr. Michael Way, VO Teacher
Texas School for the Deaf	Mr. Douglas, Superintendent Mr. Dean Cunningham, Administrative Assistant Mr. Phillip Marshall, Vocational Director Mr. John Key, Vocational Orientation
Travis State School	Mr. Lawrence, Assistant Superintendent Mr. Charles DeLisle, Principal Mr. Don Crowder, CS Teacher Ms. Joan Wuchitech, Psychologist

APPENDIX D

IN-STATE FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do you see as the objectives of your program?

2. How did you determine the occupational area for training in your pilot proposal?

3. What type of curriculum are you using or developing?

4. What provisions does your program have for pupil evaluation, counseling, placement, follow-up?

5. What is your relationship with Special Education (or Vocational Education)?

6. What is your relationship with Texas Rehabilitation Commission?

7. Do you feel there is a need for separate vocational program for handicapped students? Why or why not?

8. What criteria do you presently use to evaluate your vocational training of the handicapped?

9. What criteria do you feel should be used?

10. What provisions for in-service training do you have for your staff involved with this program?

11. How did you recruit and hire your teachers for these programs?

12. What amount of staff turnover have you had since the program began?

13. Do you feel your program is meeting the special needs of handicapped students? If yes, How? If no, how could it be more responsive?

14. What direction do you feel future programs for training the handicapped should take?

15. What is the greatest strength of the program?

16. What is the greatest weakness of the program?

17. What specific books, publications, journals, etc., have you found helpful reference for this program?

18. What programs (either in Texas or out of state) do you know of that you feel are outstanding?

APPENDIX E

LETTER SENT TO STATES & RESPONSE

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON
CENTER FOR HUMAN RESOURCES

21 January 1972

Dear:

Last fall, the Center for Human Resources received funding to conduct a study for Texas Education Agency, Division of Occupational Research and Development, to develop criteria for evaluation of pilot proposals for training the handicapped under provisions of the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968. An abstract of this project is attached for further information.

We are vitally interested in the way other states are utilizing the designated 10% vocational money for vocational training of the handicapped. We would appreciate it if you would send a summary of your state's approach to this special area. Some of the specific information we are seeking includes:

1. An approximate percentage breakdown of types of handicaps being served in your program.

2. The age level for beginning training, and the upper age level served (Are programs primarily at Junior High level or Senior High?)

3. Have separate vocational classes been developed for the handicapped or have they been integrated into regular vocational programs?

4. How the state determined priority for funding proposals.

5. Are any private, nonprofit agencies being funded to conduct training?

6. What criteria is used to evaluate program effectiveness?

We would appreciate your reply as soon as possible in the self-addressed return envelope enclosed. In addition, we would like the names of several knowledgeable program directors in your state with whom we could correspond.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

(Miss) Judy Meyer
Project Coordinator

JM:bt

Enclosure

STATES REVIEWED

Alabama
Arkansas
California
Colorado
*Florida
Georgia
*Illinois
Indiana
Kansas
*Massachusetts
Michigan
*Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
Nevada
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New Mexico (report sent only)
New York
North Dakota
Ohio
Oklahoma
*Pennsylvania
Puerto Rico
South Carolina
South Dakota
Utah
Virginia
Washinton
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming

33 States + PR

*Information on these states was gathered through visits rather than through the questionnaires.

Missing States (16)

Alaska
Arizona
Connecticut
Delaware
Hawaii
Idaho
Iowa
Kentucky
Louisiana
Maine
Maryland
North Carolina
Oregon
Rhode Island
Tennessee
Vermont

APPENDIX F

OUT-OF-STATE FIELD VISIT SITES & PERSONS CONTACTED

California	
Sacramento	Mr. Wayne Campbell, Coordinator of Program Development in Vocational Education for Handicapped (State Office of Education)
San Juan Unified District	Mr. Jim Dickson, Work-Study Coordinator
Fullerton Union HS District	Mr. Walter Retzlaff, Director-Exceptional Pupil Services
	Mr. John Dewey, Specialist, Vocational Education
Santa Ana Unified School District	Mr. Carson Hall, Work-Study Coordinator
	Mr. Ray Sothern, Coordinator-Project VITALITY
San Diego City Schools	Mr. Cecil Berry, Director of Special Education
	Dr. Ray Sipple, Jr.-Exceptional Child Program Coordinator
Grossmont Union HS District	Dr. Ronald Blazovic, Director-Special Education Programs
Colorado	
Denver	Ms. Chiyo Horiuchi, Consultant, Secondary Programs for the Handicapped (State Office of Education)
Denver Community College--Center for Hearing Impaired	Mr. Ted Guttadore, Center Director
	Mr. Arthur Washburn, Program Director
Denver Publoc Schools	Mr. Vincent Keith, Supervising Teacher: Work-Study Office
Florida	
Tallahassee	Mr. Thomas Swift, Consultant Special Vocational Programs (State Office of Education)
Brevard County ISD	Mr. Jim Wallin, Director of Special Education
	Mr. Joe Walden, Curriculum Director-Vocational Education
	Mr. Ken Hutcherson, OTP Teacher (Satellite High School)
Pinellas County ISD	Mrs. Elaine Hershey, Research Specialist
	Mrs. Ruth Hudson, Director Pupil Evaluation Center
Palm Beach County ISD	Mrs. Elizabeth Barden, Coordinator-Exceptional Child Education
Dade County ISD	Mr. Ralph Reed, Vocational Director
	Mr. Ray Chaffins, Coordinator for Handicapped Programs
Volusia County ISD	Mrs. Clarice Biggins, Supervisor, Vocational Home Economics
	Mrs. Nancy St. John,Special Education Teacher
	Mrs. Strawn, Special Education Teacher

APPENDIX F CONT'D

Georgia	
Atlanta	Mr. Don Hogan, Special Projects Coordinator Leadership Services Unit (State Office of Education
Lithonia High School	Mr. Clark Britt, Principal
Cedartown Comprehensive High School	Mr. Richard Flournoy, Vocational Supervisor
Illinois	
Springfield	Mr. Robert Sepesy, Consultant (State Office of Education)
Granite City-Alton	Mrs. Elveria Kuergeleis, Director of Special Education
Gurnee (Lake County)	Mr. Jeff Ditgen, Pre-Vocational Counselor (Special Education)
Massachusetts	
Randolph	Mr. Sumner Rotman, Consultant, Vocational Education for Handicapped (State Office of Education)
Lawrence School (Framingham)	Mr. Roger Brown, Director
Blue Hills Regional Technical School (Canton)	Mr. Ronald Linari, Program Supervisor
Cerebral Palsy Center of Greater Boston, Inc. (Newton)	Mr. Bob Hanrahan, Program Director Mr. Frank Fuller, Executive Director
The Protestant Guild for the Blind, Inc. (Watertown)	Mr. Wesley Price, Executive Director Mr. John Benbow, Program Director
Michigan	
Detroit Public Schools	Dr. Melvin Kavieff, Director-World of Work Dr. Chester Loomis, Director-Special Education Mr. Jack Dewall, Industrial Arts Instructor Mr. Carl Turnquist, Research & Evaluation
Minnesota	
Minneapolis	Mr. Clifford Holman, Coordinator, Vocational Programs for the Handicapped
St. Paul Area Technical-Vocational Institute	Mr. Robert Lauritsen, Director Mr. Pat Duggan, Counselor Mr. Roger Reddan, Counselor Ms. Alice LaBarre, Teacher Mr. John Bachman, Teacher

APPENDIX F CONT'D

Minnesota Cont'd	
Anoka-Work Adjustment Center	Mr. Thomas Mangan, Director of Special Education Mr. Dallas Flynn, Project Coordinator
Missouri	
St. Louis Special County District	Dr. John Kidd, Superintendent Ms. Nickles, Administrative Assistant
New York	
Albany	Mr. Richard Fila, Supervisor-Division of Occupational Education Supervision (State Office of Education)
City of New York	Mrs. Mary Gaskin, Coordinator-Federal Programs for the Handicapped Mrs. Frances Yauch, Placement & Referral Mr. Edward Cain, Principal (St. Joseph's School for Boys)
Nassau County BOCES (Long Island)	Mr. Clarence Becker, Assistant Supervisor-Division of Occupation Education Mrs. Charlotte Thomas, Assistant Principal-Sister Mary Kennedy School Mrs. Naomi Kunken, Principal-Beechwood School
Ohio	
Columbus	Mr. Richard Macer, Ass't. Director-Vocational Education; Special Needs & Career Orientation (State Office of Education) Dr. Orville Johnson, Dean-Exceptional Children Education--Ohio State University Dr. Harold Starr, Center for Vocational & Technical Education--Ohio State University Dr. Ralph Becker, Columbus State School
Pennsylvania	
Harrisburg	Mr. Wayne Grubb, Consultant: Disadvantaged & Handicapped Programs (State Office of Education); Dr. Ferman Moody, Director, RCU for Vocational Research
York County Vocational-Technical School	Mr. Theodore Sheckart, Director of Pupil Services Mrs. Linda Snavely, CORE Teacher
Eastern Northampton Vocationa-Technical (Easton)	Dr. Karl Dutt, Director, Pupil Services Mr. Howard Shimer, Coordinator-Special Education/Vocational Education Mrs. Bargerstock, Mrs. Malavalta, Mr. Nodoline--Teachers Mr. Dishong, Work-Experience Coordinator

APPENDIX F CONT'D

Washington

Olympia	Mr. Ken Owen, Supervisor-Vocational Education (State Office of Education)
Vancouver Public Schools	Mr. James Brooks, Vocational Education Director
	Mr. Stanley Gomulkiewicz, Special Education Director
Seattle Public Schools	Mr. Russ Arwine, Vocational Counselor Coordinator-Special Education
	Mr. Jim Daugherty, President, "Meets-A-Need" Manufacturing Company
	Mrs. Hazel Moore, Housemother
Everitt Public Schools	Mrs. Anna Cowles, Director-Special Education
	Mr. Tom Stiger, Director-Vocational Education
South Bend Public Schools	Mr. Don Lorentson, Director Special Education
	Mr. Steven Russell, Planting Foreman

APPENDIX G

OUT-OF-STATE FIELD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How did your state make the decision as to what approach to take in utilizing the mandatory 10% vocational money for the handicapped?

2. Administratively,

   a) what is the relationship between special education, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation?

   b) to what division in the state education system does the handicapped program report?

   c) are responsibilities for the handicapped programs and for programs for the disadvantaged under the same division?

3. What approach is your state taking toward the vocational education of the handicapped?

4. What ages are being served in your programs for handicapped?

5. What types of handicaps are being served in your programs?

6. Does your state have separate programs or integrated programs for handicapped students?

7. How does your state set priority for funding programs for the handicapped?

8. Are you funding any non-profit agencies from your special money?

9. What criteria does your state use for proposals for training the handicapped?

10. How does your state evaluate the effectiveness of programs for the handicapped?

11. Do you feel your programs are meeting the needs of the handicapped?

12. What is the ideal direction for the vocational training of the handicapped?

13. Has your state had more requests for program money than the 10% allocated funds would cover?

14. What is the employer involvement in your programs for handicapped?

15. What is the teacher-student ratio in vocational training programs for the handicapped?

16. How do you coordinate the academic and vocational education of handicapped students?

17. What curricula are being used in vocational training of the handicapped?

18. How many projects for training the handicapped are operating in your state?

APPENDIX H

INFORMATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE
EDUCATION SERVICE CENTER--PHASE I's

TO BE FILLED OUT BY PUPIL APPRAISAL/VOCATIONAL EVALUATOR/PUPIL EVALUATION ESC PERSONNEL

(# Responses)

Student evaluations completed--1970-1971 ___ _____

Student evaluations completed--1971-1972 ___ _____

How many evaluations were requested for 1971-1972? ___ _____

Average # hours spent in evaluative measures per student ___ _____

Time span of pupil testing: (mark appropriate line)

All in same day_____

two consecutive days_____

non-consecutive days_____ How many?_____,_____,

other_____ _____

_____

Do you test Spanish first language students in Spanish? Yes_____ No_____

Are your vocational evaluation reports prescription or general?_____

_____

Do you see the purpose of your testing to determine job placement areas for VAC's and/or Rehab. Counselors or to determine vocational training areas?

_____

Who, within the schools, obtains copies of your evaluation? How do they utilize the information contained in your reports?_____

_____

What kinds of tests are you using (test names)?_____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

Indicate approximate percentages of the categories below:

% to total tests used

paper-pencil tests_____

verbal tests _____

performance tests _____

achievement tests _____

job sampling _____

other _____

How many miles is it (one way) to the most distant school with which you are working within your region? _____ How many total square miles are in your region? _____ How many independent school districts are in your region? _____ With how many are you working? _____

What advance information do you have on students prior to testing? _____

_____

How many opinions contribute to the final recommendations in your vocational evaluation report? _____

With what age student were the majority of your testing efforts? _____

_____

What follow-up and further contact do you have with students after you have completed testing? _____

_____

Please indicate approximate percentages of your total work time involved in the categories below:

travel time _____ test scoring _____

individual student testing _____ test analysis _____

_____ test reports _____

group student testing _____ orientation of students to program

_____ _____

orientation of teachers to program _____ orientation of students to vocational information _____

orientation of teachers toward vocational material _____ other areas (please categorize)

working with schools to develop Phase II programs? _____ _____

_____

What have been the greatest problem areas encountered in operating a Phase I program? _____

_____

_____

What recommendations do you have for making Phase I programs more effective?

_____

_____

_____ _____ _____

# of pupil appraisal Personnel | Name-Region # of ESC | Name of person filling out report